



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/728,023	12/03/2003	Nancy Pettigrew	315549.01	8329
22971 7590 01/09/2009 MICROSOFT CORPORATION ONE MICROSOFT WAY REDMOND, WA 98052-6399				
EXAMINER				
SHIN, KYUNG H				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2443				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/09/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

roks@microsoft.com
ntovar@microsoft.com

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/728,023

Applicant(s)

PETTIGREW, NANCY

Examiner

Kyung Hye Shin

Art Unit

2443

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 October 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 3, 5 - 36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 3, 5 - 36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- Paper No(s) Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s) Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responding to application amendment filed on 10-17-2008. Claims 1 - 3, 5 - 36 are pending. Claims 1, 5, 13, 24 have been amended. Claim 4 has been cancelled. Claims 1, 13, 24 are independent. This application was filed on 12-3-2003.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are moot due to new grounds of rejection.

2.1 The double patenting rejection must remain until the Terminal Disclaimer is actually filed. Applicant's representative has stated in arguments dated 8-8-2007: "Applicants intend to file a terminal disclaimer when the double patenting rejection becomes final and when the claims of the present application are allowed."

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982);

In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed **terminal disclaimer** in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

- 3.1 Claims 1 - 36 are **provisionally** rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over, claims 1 - 33 of copending Application No. 10/690,422; claims 1 - 33 of copending Application No. 10/849,090; and claims 1 - 33 of copending Application No. 10/994,010.

This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending applications and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter.

Claims of the instant application therefore are not patently distinct from the other application claims and as such are unpatentable over obvious-type double patenting. Later applications claims are not patentably distinct from earlier claims, if the later claims are anticipated by the earlier claim.

- 3.2 Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other, because the subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending applications: claims 1, 5, 9, 10, 26, 30 of copending Application No. 10/690,422; claims 13, 30 of copending Application No. 10/849,090; and claims 1, 13 of copending Application No. 10/994,010, and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending applications and the instant application are claiming common subject matter.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1 - 5, 8 - 10, 13 - 16, 19 - 21, 24 - 27, 30 - 32, 35 - 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Gould et al.** (US Patent No. 7,346,700) in view of **Liu** (US PG PUB No. 20050015455) and further in view of **Freed et al.** (US Patent No. 7,275,093).

Regarding Claims 1, 13, Gould discloses a computer system for processing e-mail comprising:

wherein servers that receive e-mail messages for a plurality of different remotely located clients (Gould col 8, l 66 - col 9, l 1: monitor email traffic of multiple users (clients)), the plurality of server being part of a distributed network, wherein each packet sniffer is configured to extract originating IP addresses associated with e-mail messages that are communicated to the clients over the distributed network. (Gould col 4, ll 59-62: parses (extract) information from e-mail message and obtains IP address of computer from which e-mail message originated (originating IP address))

Gould discloses wherein a central monitor (Gould col 2, ll 31-40: email governor (central monitor); monitor email traffic from a specific IP address (originating IP address)) that communicates with the packet sniffers and that monitors data

regarding the originating IP addresses, wherein the central monitor is configured to determine whether traffic from an originating address has exceeded a threshold value (Gould col 3, ll 47-51: determine whether email message rate exceeds an email message rate threshold), the central monitor being further configured to generate a response to detect spam e-mail messages if the threshold value has been exceeded. (Gould col 2, ll 44-47: take action when rate exceeds a predetermined limit (threshold))

Gould discloses wherein extracts from the received packet originating IP addresses associated with e-mail messages that are communicated to the clients over the network. (Gould col 4, ll 59-62: parses (extracts) information from IP header from e-mail message and obtains IP address of computer from which e-mail message originated (originating IP address)) Gould does not explicitly disclose a distributed network, a plurality of packet sniffers, and a plurality of servers.

A distributed processing configuration is a well known in the art data processing configuration. And, Liu discloses a distributed processing configuration wherein: a plurality of servers, the plurality of servers being part of a distributed network; a plurality of packet sniffers, wherein each of the packet sniffers in the plurality of packets sniffers corresponds to and resides in a different server in the plurality of servers; distributed network with the plurality of packet sniffers; a server in which

the central monitor resides, wherein the server is distinct from each of the plurality of servers containing the plurality of packet sniffers in the plurality of packet sniffers in the distributed network. (Liu Figure 1 (33); (9): one SPAM filter for each mail server; para 0038, ll 13-14; para 041, ll 1-5; para 054, ll 2-5: one SPAM filter (pack sniffer) for mail server; multiple servers; multiple SPAM filters (packet sniffers))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Gould to use a distributed processing configuration for e-mail processing system as taught by Liu. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Liu in order to share information that could be correlated to detect the signature of spammers and enable operation in a distributed architecture. (Liu col. 9, lines 18-20: “ ... *Conventional spam filters in these prior art systems work in isolation, and do not share information that could be correlated to detect the signature of spammers. ...* ”)

Gould-Liu does not explicitly disclose to check a fragment offset field and SYN bit. However, Freed discloses:

a) check a fragment offset field of an IP header to ensure the IP header is the first fragment of a packet, b) determine the value of a SYN bit in a TCP header, c) disregarding the packet if the SYN bit has not been set, (Freed col 2, ll 38-40: device intercepts a message transported from a data source to a data receiver; col 9 ll 10-12: fragment offset field indicates where in data bundle this fragment belongs;

first fragment has offset zero; ; col 11, ll 8-11: first fragment (and SYN bit is set) contains an IP header and data)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Gould-Liu to check a fragment offset field and SYN bit as taught by Freed. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Freed in order to reduce fragmentation, thus saving gateways and other network devices, such as a classifier, re-assembly time and re-assembly buffer space. (Freed col 2, ll 47-49: “
... As a result, a STE can reduce fragmentation, thus saving gateways and other network devices, such as a classifier, re-assembly time and re-assembly buffer space. ... ”)

Regarding Claim 2, Gould discloses the system of claim 1:

wherein each server checks the originating IP addresses of incoming connections. (Gould col 2, ll 31-40: monitoring e-mail messaging; monitor and regulate the number of e-mail messages originating from an IP address; col 2, ll 44-47: take action when rate exceeds a predetermined limit (threshold)) Gould does not explicitly disclose a blacklist containing IP addresses that have been determined to be generating spam e-mail messages, and rejecting any connection originating from an address on the blacklist.

However, Liu discloses:

each of the servers further includes a blacklist containing IP addresses that have been determined to be generating spam e-mail messages; (Liu para 010, ll 1-5;

para 044, ll 1-5: blacklist for IP addresses for spam) and each server checks the originating IP addresses of incoming connections to the addresses contained in the blacklist, and rejects any connection originating from an address on the blacklist. (Liu para 044, ll 1-5: blacklist of IP addresses for spammers; messages from these senders will not be delivered)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Gould to add the originating IP address to the blacklist as taught by Liu. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Liu in order to share information that could be correlated to detect the signature of spammers and enable operation in a distributed architecture. (Liu col. 9, lines 18-20)

Regarding Claim 3, Gould discloses the system of claim 1 wherein each of the servers further includes a message switch that determines whether e-mail messages are spam. (Gould col 2, ll 28-31: differentiating between legitimate e-mail and spam; monitoring the number of e-mail messages originating from an IP address), and communicates e-mail messages to clients. (Gould col 3, ll 18-21: if e-mail message rate does not exceed rate threshold; send e-mail message towards its destination)

Regarding Claims 5, 16, 32, Gould discloses the system, method of claims 3, 13, 24 further comprising:

a spam database for storing rules for determining whether e-mail messages are spam; (Gould col 9, ll 40-47: determination (rules) whether e-mail sent from

originating IP address is spam)

wherein the message switch determines whether e-mail messages are spam based on the rules within the spam database. (Gould col 2, l 61 - col 3, l 3: e-mail governor (switch, device, software) monitors and determines whether mail message is spam)

Regarding Claims 8, 19, 35, Gould discloses the system, method of claims 1, 13, 24 wherein the response generated by the central monitor (Gould col 3, ll 8-17: email governor (central monitor)) comprises an alert that is communicated to a spam analyst. (Gould col 3, ll 8-14: email governor (central monitor); col 3, ll 23-26: send a message to service provider administrator (spam analyst))

Regarding Claims 9, 31, Gould discloses the system, method of claims 2, 30 (Gould col 2, ll 31-40: monitoring e-mail messaging; monitor and regulate the number of e-mail messages originating from an IP address; col 2, ll 44-47: take action when rate exceeds a predetermined limit (threshold)) and central monitor (Gould col 3, ll 8-17: email governor (central monitor)). Gould does not explicitly disclose a command to add the originating IP address to the blacklist. However, Liu discloses wherein the response generated by the monitor comprises a command to add the originating IP address to the blacklist. (Liu para 010, ll 1-5; para 044, ll 1-5: black list of known spammers; para 048, ll 1-5: user interface (command) to edit (add entry to) the black list)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Gould to add

the originating IP address to the blacklist as taught by Liu. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Liu in order to share information that could be correlated to detect the signature of spammers and enable operation in a distributed architecture. (Liu col. 9, lines 18-20)

Regarding Claims 10, 21, 27, Gould discloses the system, method of claims 1, 13, 24 wherein the threshold value comprises a rate parameter. (Gould col 2, ll 31-40: monitoring e-mail messaging; monitor and regulate the number of e-mail messages originating from an IP address; col 2, ll 41-43: check the rate at which e-mail messages originate from a specific IP address)

Regarding Claim 14, Gould discloses the system of claim 13 wherein the central monitor (Gould col 3, ll 8-17: email governor (central monitor)) resides on a server separate from the packet sniffers. (Gould Figure 1; col 4, ll 32-35: email governor (central monitor); monitor and regulate number of e-mail messages originating from an IP address)

Regarding Claims 15, Gould discloses the system of claim 13. (Gould col 2, ll 31-40: monitoring e-mail messaging; monitor and regulate the number of e-mail messages originating from an IP address; col 2, ll 44-47: take action when rate exceeds a predetermined limit (threshold)) Gould does not explicitly disclose a blacklist, and the blacklist including IP addresses that have been determined to be generating spam.

However, Liu discloses a blacklist stored on each server, the blacklist including IP addresses that have been determined to be generating spam. (Liu para 044, ll 1-5: blacklist of IP addresses for spammers; messages from these senders will not be delivered)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Gould to add the originating IP address to the blacklist as taught by Liu. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Liu in order to share information that could be correlated to detect the signature of spammers and enable operation in a distributed architecture. (Liu col. 9, lines 18-20)

Regarding Claims 20, 36, Gould discloses the system of claims 13, 24 wherein the response generated by the central monitor comprises a command to the system to block future e-mail messages from the originating IP address. (Gould col 5, ll 47-51: e-mail governor (central monitor); col 5, ll 56-58: block mail messages from email address)

Regarding Claims 24, Gould discloses a method for processing e-mail and detecting spam e-mail messages, comprising:

extracting originating IP addresses associated with e-mail messages that are communicated to the plurality of remotely located clients; (Gould col 4, ll 59-62; parse (extract) information from e-mail message and obtain IP address from which the e-mail message originated)

monitoring data regarding originating IP addresses; (Gould col 3, ll 37-46: monitors the cumulative bytes of email messages from an IP address (originating IP address))

determining whether traffic from an originating IP address has exceeded a threshold value; (Gould col 5, ll 46-51: determines whether e-mail message rate exceed an email message rate threshold)

generating, at a central monitor, a response for use in detecting spam e-mail messages if the threshold value has been exceeded. (Gould col 3, ll 23-26: appropriate notification to administrator)

Gould discloses routing the e-mail messages for a plurality of different remotely located clients, and communicating the processed messages to the plurality of remotely located clients. (Gould col 3, ll 5-10; col 3, ll 18-21: route e-mail, if e-mail message rate does not exceed threshold e-mail sent to its destination; col 8, l 66 - col 7, l 1: traffic monitor traffic of all users (clients)) Gould does not explicitly disclose a distributed network including a plurality of servers that receive and process e-mail messages.

However, Liu discloses:

a distributed network including a plurality of servers that receive and process e-mail messages; (Liu Figure 1 (33); (9): one SPAM filter for each mail server; para 0038, ll 13-14; para 041, ll 1-5; para 054, ll 2-5: one SPAM filter (pack sniffer) for mail server; multiple servers; multiple SPAM filters (packet sniffers)) use of the plurality of servers; (Liu col 1, ll 32-41: e-mail processing system Figure 1

((33); (9)): one SPAM filter for each mail server; para 0038, ll 13-14; para 041, ll 1-5; para 054, ll 2-5: one SPAM filter (pack sniffer) for mail server; multiple servers; multiple SPAM filters (packet sniffers))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Gould to enable a distributed processing configuration for e-mail processing system as taught by Liu. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Liu in order to share information that could be correlated to detect the signature of spammers and enable operation in a distributed architecture. (Liu col. 9, lines 18-20)

Gould-Liu does not explicitly disclose to check a fragment offset field and SYN bit. However, Freed discloses:

a) check a fragment offset field of an IP header to ensure the IP header is the first fragment of a packet, b) determine the value of a SYN bit in a TCP header, c) disregarding the packet if the SYN bit has not been set, (Freed col 2, ll 38-40: device intercepts a message transported from a data source to a data receiver; col 9 ll 10-12: fragment offset field indicates where in data bundle this fragment belongs; first fragment has offset zero; ; col 11, ll 8-11: first fragment (and SYN bit is set) contains an IP header and data)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Gould-Liu to check a fragment offset field and SYN bit as taught by Freed. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Freed in order

to reduce fragmentation, thus saving gateways and other network devices, such as a classifier, re-assembly time and re-assembly buffer space. (Freed col 2, ll 47-49)

Regarding Claims 25, Gould discloses the method of claim 24 further comprising: storing data regarding the originating IP addresses in a database. (Gould col 4, l 63 - col 5, l 3: datastore receives origination IP address and other e-mail metrics, spam and message store)

Regarding Claims 26, Gould discloses the method of claim 24.

checking addresses, and determining whether traffic from an originating IP address has exceeded a threshold. (Gould col 2, ll 31-40: monitoring e-mail messaging; monitor and regulate the number of e-mail messages originating from an IP address; col 2, ll 44-47: take action when rate exceeds a predetermined limit (threshold)) Gould does not explicitly disclose checking originating IP addresses against the list and determining whether traffic from an originating IP address has exceeded a threshold value only if the originating IP address is not in the list.

However, Liu discloses:

checking originating IP addresses against the list; (Liu para 044, ll 1-5: blacklist of IP addresses for spammers; messages from these senders will not be delivered) determining whether traffic from an originating IP address has exceeded a threshold value only if the originating IP address is not in the list. (Liu para 044, ll 1-5: blacklist of IP addresses for spammers; messages from these senders will not be

delivered)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Gould to add the originating IP address to the blacklist as taught by Liu. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Liu in order to share information that could be correlated to detect the signature of spammers and enable operation in a distributed architecture. (Liu col. 9, lines 18-20)

Regarding Claims 30, Gould discloses the method of claim 24. (Gould col 2, ll 31-40: monitoring e-mail messaging; monitor and regulate the number of e-mail messages originating from an IP address; col 2, ll 44-47: take action when rate exceeds a predetermined limit (threshold))

Gould does not explicitly disclose a blacklist.

However, Liu discloses:

storing IP addresses that have been determined to be generating spam in a blacklist; (Liu para 044, ll 1-5: blacklist of IP addresses for spammers; messages from these senders will not be delivered)

checking originating IP addresses of incoming connections to the servers against the IP addresses contained in the blacklist; (Liu para 044, ll 1-5: blacklist of IP addresses for spammers; messages from these senders will not be delivered)

rejecting any connection originating from an IP address in the blacklist. (Liu para 044, ll 1-5: blacklist of IP addresses for spammers; messages from these senders will not be delivered)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Gould to use a blacklist as taught by Liu. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Liu in order to share information that could be correlated to detect the signature of spammers and enable operation in a distributed architecture. (Liu col. 9, lines 18-20)

6. Claims **6, 7, 17, 18, 33, 34** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Gould-Liu-Freed** and further in view of **Bandini et al.** (US Patent No. **7,117,358**).

Regarding Claims 6, 17, 33, Gould discloses the system, method of claims 5, 16, 32. (Gould col 2, ll 31-40: monitoring e-mail messaging; monitor and regulate the number of e-mail messages originating from an IP address; col 2, ll 44-47: take action when rate exceeds a predetermined limit (threshold)) Gould does not explicitly disclose assigning a score. However, Bandini discloses wherein each rule in the database is assigned a score that is used to determine whether an e-mail message is spam. (Bandini col. 4, lines 50-54; col. 4, lines 63-67: score used for ranking mail messages as spam)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Gould to assign a score used in spam determination as taught by Bandini. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Bandini in order to eliminate the ability of spam to consume time and undermine a user's capacity to receive other, desirable messages. (Bandini col. 1, lines 21-26: " ... *Reviewing the*

SPAM messages consumes time, which may be highly valuable in the case of workplace time, and may also undermine the user's capacity to receive other, desirable, messages. Accordingly, there is a need for a method that reduces the number of SPAM messages users receive. ...")

Regarding Claims 7, 18, 34, Gould discloses the system, method of claims 6, 17, 33. (Gould col 2, ll 31-40: monitoring e-mail messaging; monitor and regulate the number of e-mail messages originating from an IP address; col 2, ll 44-47: take action when rate exceeds a predetermined limit (threshold)) Gould does not explicitly disclose raising the score of a rule. However, Bandini discloses wherein the response generated by the monitor comprises raising the score of a rule corresponding to the originating IP address. (Bandini col. 4, lines 48-52: update score)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Gould to raising the score of a rule as taught by Bandini. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Bandini in order to eliminate the ability of spam to consume time and undermine a user's capacity to receive other, desirable messages. (Bandini col. 1, lines 21-26)

7. Claims **11, 12, 22, 23, 28, 29** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Gould-Liu-Freed** and further in view of **Lewis et al.** (US PGPub No. **20030109248**).

Regarding Claims 11, 22, 28, Gould discloses the system, method of claims 1, 13, 24.

(Gould col 2, ll 31-40: monitoring e-mail messaging; monitor and regulate the number of e-mail messages originating from an IP address; col 2, ll 44-47: take action when rate exceeds a predetermined limit (threshold)) Gould does not explicitly disclose a maximum total connections parameter. However, Lewis discloses wherein a maximum total connections parameter. (Lewis para 296, ll 5-7; para 483, ll 2-8: connections)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Gould to use a maximum total connections parameter as taught by Lewis. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Lewis in order to utilize an improved customer interface for email processing. (Lewis para 009, ll 1-7)

Regarding Claims 12, 23, 29, Gould discloses the system, method of claims 1, 13, 24 wherein the monitor determines whether an originating IP address has exceeded a threshold value. (Gould col 2, ll 31-40: monitoring e-mail messaging; monitor and regulate the number of e-mail messages originating from an IP address; col 2, ll 44-47: take action when rate exceeds a predetermined limit (threshold)) Gould does not explicitly disclose maximum connections allowed parameter. However, Lewis discloses the use of a token bucket algorithm including a rate parameter and maximum connections allowed parameter. (Lewis para 296, ll 5-7; para 483, ll 2-8: connections, rate (per second))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Gould to use a maximum connections allowed parameter as taught by Lewis. One of ordinary skill in

the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Lewis in order to utilize an improved customer interface for email processing. (Lewis para 009, II 1-7)

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyung Hye Shin whose telephone number is (571)272-3920. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 am - 6 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tonia L. Dollinger can be reached on (571) 272-4170. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kyung Hye Shin
Examiner
Art Unit 2443

KHS
December 30, 2008

/Nathan J. Flynn/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2454